Appln No. 10/635,122

Amdt date May 30, 2007

Reply to Office action of March 2, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-11, 14-17, 22-26, and 30-34 remain in this application with claims 12

and 27 canceled pursuant to the amendment set forth above.

In the March 2, 2007 Office action, the examiner finally rejected all claims as anticipated

by, or in the alternative, obvious over Mori et al. As an initial matter, applicant wishes to point

out that in the prior response, applicant amended claims 1 and 17 to include the limitations of

dependent claims 7 and 21 which were canceled, and successfully overcame the examiner's

rejection of the pending claims. Because the examiner cites new art in rejecting what are in

effect, original claims, applicant submits that the present action should not have been made final,

and requests that the finality be withdrawn.

Turning to the substance of the Office action, applicant submits that despite the

examiner's contentions, nowhere do Mori et al. teach or suggest the use of either

 $-OC(=O)(CH_2)_nOC(=O)CH=CH_2$ or $-OC(=O)(CH_2)_nOC(=O)CCH_3$ as the (meth)acrylic ester in

the polymer electrolyte as presently claimed. It is noted that this limitation from canceled

dependent claims 12 and 27 has been incorporated into both independent claims, claims 1 and

17, and claims 12 and 27 have been canceled. Since all claims now include this limitation which

is neither taught nor suggested by the cited art, applicant submits that all claims are now

allowable over the cited art.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-11, 14-17, 22-26, and 30-34 remain in this application, and based on the

amendments set forth above, applicant requests the allowance of all claims. However, if there

are any remaining issues, the examiner is asked to contact applicant's counsel at the number

below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

David A. Plumley

Reg. No. 37,208

626/795-9900

DAP/gl

GL PAS730243.1-*-05/30/07 9:21 AM

-7-